From:	Howard Medwed
To:	Kelley, Craig
Subject:	Hewlett Packard
Date:	Wednesday, April 25, 2018 9:20:17 AM

A vote for the measure to terminate or not renew the City's contract with Hewlett Packard because of its ties to Israel would send a distinctly anti-Semitic message. I will never vote for an anti-Semite.

Participation in the Arab boycott of Israel is against U.S. law, and requests to participate must be reported to the U.S. Department of Commerce Bureau of Industry Office of Antiboycott Compliance. While the tax penalty provisions of 26 U.S. Code Section 999 may have little teeth against the City, the antiboycott regulations can have far reaching effects, e.g. eligibility of the City for Federal grants. It is in the interest of the City to stay out of the Arab Israeli conflict.

During the mid-1970's the United States adopted two laws that seek to counteract the participation of U.S. citizens in other nation's economic boycotts or embargoes. These "antiboycott" laws are the 1977 amendments to the Export Administration Act (EAA) and the Ribicoff Amendment to the 1976 Tax Reform Act (TRA). While these laws share a common purpose, there are distinctions in their administration.

Howard D. Medwed
Burns & Levinson LLP
Co-Chair Tax Practice | Tax Group
125 Summer Street | Boston, MA 02110
617.345.3352 (d) | 617.345.3299 (f)
burnslev.com | hmedwed@burnslev..com
Firm Bio
::::::